

Tibor ŽIVKOVIĆ
Institute of History
Belgrade

CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS AND THE RAGUSAN AUTHORS BEFORE 1611

The work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De administrando imperio* (*DAI*) was first edited by Johannes Meursius in 1611.¹ The title of the work cannot be considered quite appropriate, since it is not authorial, but given to it by its first editor, who based himself on its introduction.² It is interesting that the learned humanists of the sixteenth century did not know this work, although two copies of *DAI* had been made between 1509 and 1529. The only exceptions in this respect were some Ragusan authors, who will be considered in the following discussion. But before we enter into an analysis of the use of the material from *DAI* by the Ragusan authors, we should say something about the fate of the known manuscripts of this work, for tracing their trajectories might give us some idea of how these writers came to the information contained in it.

The earliest manuscript of *DAI*, written on vellum, Codex Parisinus 2009, is first mentioned in the catalogue of the library of Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi (1501-1550). Niccolò Ridolfi possessed 618

¹ Constantini Imperatoris Porphyrogeniti, *De Administrando Imperio, ad Romanum F. Liber nunquam antehac editus*. Ioannes Meursius primus vulgavit, Latinam interpretationem, ac Notas adjecit. Lvgdvni Batavorvm, Ex officinâ typographicâ Ioannis Balduini, impensis verò Ludovici Elzeviri 1611.

² This work of Porphyrogenitus has been recently cited after a sentence from the Introduction : - πρὸς τὸν ἔδιον νιὸν Ἀρμανὸν. Cf. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio I - II*, ed. R.J.H. Jenkins – Gy. Moravesik, Washington D.C. 1967, 44 (= *DAI*). This is, however, merely an introductory remark meant to inform the reader of what he will find in the work, and it is addressed to the Emperor's son Romanus. Consequently, this could not have been the title of the entire work.

Greek manuscripts, and item 21 in the list is described as “*Constantini Romanorum Imperatoris ad Romanum filium descriptio gentium et locorum, ac varia historia ad rectam administrationem tendens*”.³ (*Description of peoples and places, and various stories relating to proper government, written by Constantine, Emperor of Romans, for his son Romanus*). The work in question was no doubt *DAI*. The manuscript from Ridolfi's collection was acquired by Pietro Strozzi, and afterwards, in 1560, it became a part of the collection of Catherine de Medici. In 1599 it was transferred to the Royal Library in Paris, where it is kept now.⁴

It is from this manuscript that Antony Eparchus,⁵ a learned Greek from Corfu, made a copy in 1509. Another transcript was made from this copy, probably in the same year. A small part of it was copied by Antony Eparchus and the rest was transcribed by his collaborator Michael Damascene, a Cretan by origin.⁶ Both copies, the first marked V (*Codex Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 126*) and the other marked F (*Codex Parisinus gr. 2967*), are on paper. Manuscript F is based on V, so that the two transcripts were obviously made sequentially.⁷ Already in 1516 Johannes Baptista Egnatius wrote, not without some pride: "We keep that book as a precious thing in our library. The emperor himself relates many things

³ Ridolfi's Catalogue was published by B. Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova II*, Parisiis 1739, 777. This manuscript does not figure, however, in the earliest known catalogue of the Ridolfi collection; cf. D. F. Jackson, *Inventory of the Library of Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi*, *Manuscripta* 45/46 (2003) 55 – 77.

⁴ A brief account of the "movements" of this manuscript is given in *DAI I*, 16 – 17. This manuscript of *DAI* was in the possession of Caesar John Ducas, as it is recorded on the last page of the codex, and the copyist was his personal secretary Michael Royzak. Accordingly, its editors suggest that it should be dated into the period between 1059 and 1081; cf. *DAI I*, 16. It is known, however, that John Ducas had to take monastic orders in 1074 and that he spent the rest of his life in a monastery; cf. D. I. Polemis, *The Doukai*, London 1968, 39. In view of this and of the fact that the manuscript was transcribed by his personal secretary, its dating should be narrowed down to the period 1059 – 1074.

⁵ An exhaustive account of Antony Eparchus is to be found in É. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XV^e et XVI^e siècles I*, Paris 1962, ccx – ccxxvii.

⁶ Cf. *DAI I*, 16, 21 – 23.

⁷ *DAI I*, 23, suggests 1509 – 1529, as the period of the origin of F. Since P was in possession of John Egnatius by 1516 at the latest, and since F is a literal copy of P, it may be concluded that both manuscripts date from the same year – i.e. 1509.

about our Venetians in it".⁸ Manuscript F is first mentioned in a catalogue from Fontainebleau in France in 1529.⁹

Mavro Orbini inserted in his work *The Kingdom of the Slavs* a quotation from the description of Ragusa in Chapter 29 of *DAI*.¹⁰ Orbini published this passage in Italian translation, presumably basing himself on a text which was either in Latin or already translated into Italian. Discussing the devastation of Epidaurus, which he believed was destroyed by the Goths, Orbini cites in support of this view, advanced by Philippo da Bergamo, a work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus entitled : *Foedera, iura ac societates imperii Romani*. No work of this title attributed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus is known, but it may be inferred from Orbini's quotation that the text in question is in fact *DAI*. It may be added that in 1516 Johannes Baptista Egnatius had already described *DAI* as a work which describes : *summam totius imperii, sociorum omnium foedera, hostium uires, rationes...etc.*

Orbini's text on Ragusa runs:

La città di Rausa (dice egli) prese nome questo dal Sasso, che i Greci chiamano λασ. Onde prima furono appellati Lausei; ma poi per la mutatione della lettera furono detti Rausei: i quali prima furono Epidaurij da Epidauro città, la quale col restante della Dalmatia fù presa da gli Slauinis e i cittadini parte furono ammazzati, e parte menati in cattiuità. Quelli, che fuggirono da queste ruine, ritirandosi ne' luoghi eminenti, fabricarono vna terriciola, la quale poi accresciuta, cinsero di mura, che tiraia mezo miglio di circuito. Li primi Autori di questa furono Gregorio, Arsatio, Valentino Arcidiacono, & Fauentino prete di S. Stefano. Sono fin' à questa mia età anni cinquecento, dopo che partiti da Salona, fabricarono detta Città. Nella qual' è posto s. Pancratio, nella sudetta Chiesa di S. Stefano la quale hoggi si vede in mezo della città. Questi Rausei astretti da poco, & sterile paese, con maggior studio

⁸ J. B. Egnatius, *De Caesaribus libri III a dictatore Caesare ad Constantinum Palaeologum, hinc à Carolo Magno ad Maximilianum Caesarem*, Venetiis 1516, 329v.

⁹ H. Omont, *Catalogues des manuscrits grecs de Fontainebleau sous François I^r et Henri II*, Paris 1889, 372.

¹⁰ *Il Regno de gli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni Historia di don Mavro Orbini Ravseo abate melitense*, Pesaro 1601, 181 (= Orbini).

attendono alle mercantie, & à i traffichi maritimi, che all' agricoltura de' campi.

Orbini marked off clearly the conclusion of the quotation from Porphyrogenitus by the sentence: *Et fino qui parla Costantino.*¹¹ This is followed by the remark that the Emperor wrote this work in 959 "after the *Treatise of the Mutation of the States (Trattato delle mutatione de gli Stati)* by Arpontaco Burdugalense" (from Bordeaux). This shows where Orbini actually got his *DAI* quotation from – from Arpontaco Burdugalense, an author who has remained unknown to modern scholarship.

Two essential differences between the Orbini quotation and *DAI* are immediately apparent. The first concerns the passage about the gradual expansion of Ragusa, which Porphyrogenitus describes as a three-stage enlargement of the urban core, which grew until the town had... (οἰκοδομήσαντες αὐτὸ πρότερον μικρόν, καὶ πάλιν μετὰ ταῦτα μείζον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο πάλιν τὸ τεῖχος αὐτοῦ αὐξήσαντες μέχρι + δέ ἔχειν + τὸ κάστρον διὰ τὸ πλατύνεσθαι αὐτοὺς κατ' ὀλίγον καὶ πληθύνεσθαι). The text of *DAI* is damaged at this place in all the known manuscripts, and the wording is not completely clear. In Orbini, however, the passage speaks of a two-stage expansion only, and the description ends with the remark that at length *the walls of the town had half a mile in circuit*.

The other difference between Orbini and Porphyrogenitus is to be found in the concluding sentence of Orbini's quotation: *These Ragusans, being confined within a small area of barren soil, engage with greater dedication in commerce and maritime trade than in the cultivation of fields.* This sentence is missing in the manuscripts of *DAI* which are known today.

In addition to these two discrepancies, there are two others, which are not insignificant although they are not so conspicuous. One concerns LAS, the only Greek word which Orbini takes over. Porphyrogenitus says that the Romaic word for precipice is LAU (ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐπάνω τῶν κρημνῶν ἴσταται, λέγεται ῥωμαϊστὶ ὁ κρημνὸς λαῦ), hence Lausa, of

¹¹ *Orbini*, 181.

which Rausa is a later corruption. Orbini writes, however, LAS, not LAU. Scholars think that LAU is a Dalmatian Romanism derived from Latin *labes*, meaning "faultline", "chasm", "ruination", as Radoslav Katičić affirms.¹² Porphyrogenitus's expression λέγεται ῥωμαϊστὶ ὁ κρημνὸς λαῦ, probably does not mean "**which is said precipitous lau in Latin**", but "**which is said steep rock in Greek**". Indeed, the word λαῖς, recorded by Hesychius of Alexandria in the fifth/sixth century, means "stone" or "rock".¹³ But Orbini, who knew no Greek, could not have written this if he had not seen it in the source he used. This could have been written only by someone much more learned and with a good command of Greek. In other words, LAU is not a Dalmatian-Roman word, but a local expression of Greek origin, derived from the Greek word λαῖς.¹⁴ The form λαῦ, which should be the genitive case correctly spelled λαοῦ, with the omicron omitted) does not seem to be a copyist's slip, but an accepted form of the nominative, current in the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Hence the sentence "which is said a steep rock in Greek" (referring to the steep slope on which the inhabitants of the original Ragusa dwelt). It is conceivable that the original name of the settlement on the slope, which was named Rausa (Ragusa) later, had been κάστρον τοῦ λαοῦ.

Another, and less conspicuous discrepancy concerns the names of the first founders of the town. Porphyrogenitus listed seven of them: (Ἐκ δὲ τῶν μετοικησάντων εἰς τὸ Ραούσιον εἰσὶν οὗτοι: Γρηγόριος, Ἀρσάφιος, Βικτωρῖνος, Βιτάλιος, Βαλεντῖνος, ὁ ἀρχιδιάκων, Βαλεντῖνος, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ πρωτοσπαθαρίου Στεφάνου). Orbini left out

¹² R. Katičić, *Aedificaverunt Ragusium et habitaverunt in eo. Tragom najstarijih dubrovačkih zapisa*, Uz početke hrvatskih početaka, Split 1993, 135.

¹³ The form λαῖς = λαῦ is cited only by the Greek lexicographer Hesychius of Alexandria (fifth/sixth century). The expression λαστρυγλίας, means, λίθος τετριμένος "quadrangular stone"; cf. *A Greek-English Lexicon I – II*, com. by H. G. Liddell – R. Scott, Oxford 1973, I, 1031. On Hesychius of Alexandria see *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium I – III*, ed. A. Kazhdan, Oxford 1991, II, 924.

¹⁴ Ivan Đurić showed some time ago that Constantine Porphyrogenitus in using ῥωμαϊστὶ here probably had in mind Greek, not Latin; cf. I. Đurić, *Romejski govor i jezik Konstantina VII Porfirogenita*, ZRVI 24/25 (1986) 120. The learned Ragusan author Ignat Đordić 1737) also understood λαῦ as *dicitur Graece praecipitum Lav.* Moreover, Đordić also considered ῥωμαϊστὶ as *novae Romae idiomate*.

two of the seven (Victorinus and Valentinus) and replaced protospatharios Stephen with Faventinus, a priest of the Church of St Stephen. The omission was probably accidental, and the transformation of protospatharios Stephen into a priest of the Church of St Stephen was presumably a result of the imperfect understanding of the Greek text. It is far more interesting and important that the form Faventinus is also recorded in the earliest manuscript of *DAI* as Βανεντῖνος.¹⁵ This error is corrected by Eparch Antonius in two copies, where it is clearly written Βαλεντῖνος. This shows that Arpontaco Burdugalense, to whom Orbini refers, did not have the copies of Eparch Antonius before him. Accordingly, the error contained in the earliest transcript of *DAI* existed also in the copy which is richer in detail (the perimeter of the town walls, the sentence relating to the commercial activity of the Ragusans, the correction of LAU into LAS), and which belongs to another manuscript tradition of *DAI*.

Finally, it is particularly important that Arpontaco Burdugalense explicitly says that Porphyrogenitus wrote his work in 959. The reference to 948/949 as the year in which Porphyrogenitus wrote Chapter 29 of *DAI* is preserved precisely in this chapter.¹⁶

Orbini's work is full of typographic errors, and it would not be surprising if the year 959 was in fact just one of them. But, if the year is recorded accurately, this alters radically our knowledge of the date of *DAI*, i.e. it permits the hypothesis that the Emperor finished the final redaction of *DAI* in the course of 959, before 9 November (when he died). But before I say something about this possibility and adduce some more substantial evidence in support of it, we should turn to some other Ragusan authors who had used the information contained in Chapter 29 of *DAI* before Orbini.

¹⁵ Cf. *DAI I*, 135.232: Βανεντῖνος Bekkerus in his edition, *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus De thematibus et De administrando imperio*, rec. I. Bekkerus, Bonnae 1840, 137 (= Bekkerus), retains *Banentinus* in the Latin version of the text, although he corrects it into *Valentinus* (Βαλεντῖνος) in the Greek text.

¹⁶ *DAI I*, 29.234 – 235.

About fifty years before Mavro Orbini, i.e. around 1550, Niccolo Ragnina (1494-1582)¹⁷ compiled his *Annals of Ragusa*.¹⁸ The work is actually a reworking of the *Annals* by the so-called Ragusan Anonym, a work which had been written not long before Ragnina and which does not contain material from *DAI*.¹⁹ Ragnina's additions to the Anonym's work included some details concerning the earliest history of Ragusa. Thus he inserted, almost at the very beginning of his narration, which is in Italian, the extract from a Latin text containing data known from Chapter 29 of *DAI*.

Anno Christi 944 Constantinus Imperator, ex libro cuius Imperatoris, (qui) ad Romanum filium Caesarem appellatur, in ea parte, ubi de Dalmatia tractat:

*Oppidum Rhagusinum dictum a saxo, quod graece las dicitur, unde prius Lausaei, quasi in praecipitibus locis et saxosis positi, postea vero per immutationem litterae Rhagusaei, quia ante Epidaurii nuncupati sunt. Hoc oppidum a Slavis cum reliqua Dalmatia captum oppugnatumque est, civesque ipsi, pars imperfecti, pars in servitutem abacti; qui vero calamitatem aufugere potuerunt, altissima petentes loca oppidulum in vici formam construxere, quod postea in majus auctum cinxere moenibus quattuor stadiorum ambitu. Condendae urbis auctores hi celebres habentur, Gregorius, Arsarius, Victorinus, Vitalis, Valentinus archidiaconus, Faventinus pater s. Stephani. Quingenti sunt anni ad meam aetatem, ex quo Salonis profecti oppidum condidere; in quo oppido positus est divus Pancratius in divi Stephani aede, quae hodie in medio urbis posita conspicitur.*²⁰

It should be noted out that Ragnina points out, in a short prologue preceding this quotation, that the text which follows is taken from the book of Emperor Constantine to his son Romanus, and, more specifically, from the passage relating to the province of Dalmatia. These

¹⁷ *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije VII*, Zagreb 1968, 43.

¹⁸ *Annali di Ragusa del magnifico ms. Nicolò di Ragnina*, Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, ed. S. Nodilo, Zagrabiæ 1883, 166 – 301 (= *Ragnina*).

¹⁹ *Annales Ragusini Anonymi*, ed. S. Nodilo, Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, Scriptores I, Zagrabiæ 1883, 3 – 163.

²⁰ *Ragnina*, 168

words show that the note was made by someone familiar with the entire work, for the fact that the work is dedicated to the Emperor's son Romanus is mentioned only in the Introduction of *DAI*. It should be also noted that Ragnina mentions that the work dates from 944, which adds another problem to the interpretation of this extract. The quotation from *DAI* also has LAS instead of LAU, but in this case the word is written in Latin, not Greek, and it is explicitly stated that LAS is a Greek word: *Oppidum Rhagusinum dictum a saxo, quod graece las dicitur*. Further, it is stated in the text (as in Orbini's quotation) that the town defence walls were extended in two (not three) stages, and the conclusion of the sentence reads: *until the walls had a perimeter of four stadia*. Four stadia correspond to half a mile. It is interesting that the earliest perimeter of Ragusa was, according to archaeological investigations, about 960 metres, which is only slightly more than half a Byzantine mile (1460 metres).²¹ Such a detail could have been supplied only by a person writing at the time when the town had the specified perimeter, i.e. in the tenth century. As regards the names of the first founders of Ragusa, Ragnina lists all seven of them, with a slight variation – he writes "sp" instead of "protospatharios", presumably meant as an abbreviation of "spatharios". Archdeacon Valentinus is listed, as in Orbini, as Faventinus. The additional sentence concerning the disposition of the Ragusans for trade is missing.

A few pages later Ragnina quotes again the text from *DAI*, this time in Italian. This is not a translation of the previously cited Latin text, but a quotation which he found somewhere in that form and inserted into his work.

*Ex libro etiam di Constantino imperatore ad Romano suo fiolo, Cesare appellato, in parte dove di statocratia tratta, o ver scripto:*²²

²¹ Cf. I. Stevoić, *New Cognizance on Early Byzantine Dubrovnik in the 6th Century*, *Starinar* 42 (1991) 146. A Byzantine mile measured 1460 metres; cf. *DAI* II, 48, 9/53.

²² The concluding part of the introductory sentence, *dove di statocratia tratta, o ver scripto*, was suggested by the editor, S. Nodilo, who pointed out in a note (*Ragnina*, 175, n. 1) that the reading of the manuscript was: *dove di dato Matia tratta, over scripto dicono*. I have not consulted the manuscript tradition of Ragnina's *Annals*, but I believe, bearing in mind the Latin version quoted by Ragnina only a few pages earlier, which says *in ea parte, ubi de Dalmatia tractat*, that Nodilo wrongly emended the damaged

La città di Ragusa (è) ditta da sasso, che in greco Las s'appella; unde in prima Lausei, quasi in elli precipiti et sassosi lochi posti, poi veramente per la immutation delle litere Ragusei sono chiamati, quali antiquamente Epidaurini si nominavano. Questa città dalli Slavi, o vero Goti, con tutta la Dalmatia, fu expugnata; li cittadini di quella, parte furno ammazzati, et parte in servitù menati. Et quali veramente la calamità poterono fuggire, alli altissimi lochi fuggirono, castello in forma di casale edificaroni, quale poi, in maggior augumento, cinsero con li muri, quattro stadj quasi el circuito. Fra li auctori della città questi celeberrimi furono: Gregorio, Arsatio, Victorino, Vitale, Valentino archidiacono, Faventino. 500 furno anni, fino all' età mia, (che) quivi dalla città di Salona (sono) venuti (e) questa città hanno edificato.

Tratta questa istoria in ello libro hactenus; quale Constantino par essere stato al mondo nelli anni di Cristo 940.²³

This translation, too, preserves the Greek LAS and mentions the perimeter of four stadia. Six founders of the town are named - protospatharios Stephen is omitted and a full stop is placed after the name of his father Faventinus. Neither this passage retains the sentence with which Oribini concluded his quotation. But there is another interesting point – referring to the destruction of Epidaurus, the text says that the attackers were the Slavs or the Goths (*o vero Goti*), which shows that someone had interpolated this conclusion before Ragnina, who does not discuss the Goths and Epidaurus. An additional difficulty is posed by Ragnina's explanation that the Emperor wrote this book in 940.

Finally we come, climbing down the chronological ladder, to Lodovico da Cerva Tubero (d. 1527). In his work *Commentarii de temporibvs svis*,²⁴ which includes an excursus on the earliest history of Ragusa, Tubero mentions the legend of Pavlimir and of the manner in which exiles from Rome decided to build Ragusa. *Ubi intellexit eos maxime, qui tenuiores genere ac fortunis erant, praeoptare maritima*

text, which is probably only a translation of the corresponding Latin sentence and which in all likelihood read: *dove di Dalmatia tratta*.

²³ *Ragnina*, 175.

²⁴ *Lvdovici Tvberonis Dalmatae abbatis Commentarii de temporibvs svis*, prir. V. Rezar, Zagreb 2001 (= *Tubero*).

loca, utpote emporio magis idonea, seque malle mercatura ac nauigatione quam cultura sterilis ac asperi circa soli uictum quaerere...²⁵ This quotation includes the sentence from *DAI* cited by Orbini, which is not found in the known manuscripts of that work - *Questi Rausei astretti da poco, & sterile paese, con maggior studio attendono alle mercantie, & à i traffichi maritimi, che all' agricoltura de' campi.*

In his digression on the earliest past of Ragusa Tubero used mostly the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea, which he describes as very old, but not so damaged that it could not be deciphered.²⁶ It would seem that the Ragusan Sallustius, as Tubero was called because of his superb mastery of Latin, combined at least two sources in this passage – the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea (the legend of Pavlimir) and the version of Chapter 29 of *DAI* which Orbini quoted from Arpontaco Burdugalense

Tubero, however, supplies another interesting detail, not found in the earliest manuscript of the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea, i.e. the account of the foundation of the Church of St Stephen Protomartyr in the centre of the city: *In medio fere oppidi, regionem hanc nunc incolae Pusternam nuncupant, Polimirus diui Stephani Protomartyris erigit templum, reliquiasque Neraei, Archilei ac Pancratii martyrum, Petronillaeque ac Domitillae uirginum argento inclusas, secumque Roma asportatas ibi condit...*²⁷

It is possible that this detail was based on the verses of the earliest known Ragusan poet Miletius:

*Ad decus et laudem Stephani Protomartyris extat
Castellum: templum fundant, et corpora credunt
Sanctorum, quorum sunt nomina scripta, subaudis:
Nerei, Achillei, Domitillae, Petronillaeque,
Quae secum furtim tulerant Roma fugientes*

It should be pointed out, however, that Miletius mentions Nereus, Achilleus, Domitilla and Petronilla, but he says nothing about the relics of Pancratius. They are mentioned in this context, as being kept in the

²⁵ *Tubero*, 89.

²⁶ *Tubero*, 87. Tubero is also the first author who explicitly says that he uses *Docleatēm authorem*.

Church of St Stephen Protomartyr in the middle of the town (*in medio fere oppidi*), only by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in Chapter 29 of *DAI* (Ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ κάστρῳ κεῖται ὁ ἄγιος Παγκράτιος ἐν τῷ νοῶ τοῦ ἀγίου Στεφάνου, τῷ ὅντι μέσον τοῦ αὐτοῦ κάστρου).²⁷

Moreover, some other sentences from Chapter 29 of *DAI* which describe the founding of Ragusa can also be found in Tubero. His sentence: *Addunt etiam arcem ipsam, lingua Epidauria Lauusam, eo quod in praeruptis saxis posita esset, uocitatam in quod quidem nomen totam mox urbem abisse traduntr Lauusa in Rhacusam mutata*,²⁸ seems to be a mere paraphrase of the Annals of the Priest of Doclea - ...*aedificaverunt civitatem supra mare in ripis marinis, quas Epidaurii lingua sua "laus" dicunt. Unde ea civitas "Lausium" vocata est, quae postea r pro l posita, Ragusium appellata est*.²⁹ A little later, however, Tubero relates again how Ragusa was named Lausa, which subsequently became Ragusa, but this time his text resembles the account given by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in Chapter 29 of *DAI*. “*Alii, ut paulo ante dictum est, ab Epidauriis inditum arbitrantur, qui quidem eam a rupibus, in quibus oppidum constructum est, eorum lingua Lauusam appellarunt paulatimque pro Lausa Rhacusam esse nominatam, vulgo per linguae corruptelam literas immutante*.³⁰ This description resembles most closely Constantine's account: Ή δὲ κοινὴ συνήθεια, ἡ πολλάκις μεταφείρουσα τὰ ὄνόματα τῇ ἐναλλαγῇ τῶν γραμμάτων, μεταβαλοῦσα τὴν κλῆσιν Ῥαουσαίους τούτους ἐκάλεσεν.³¹

Tubero's *Alii* (authors, writers) are not known, but the marked similarity with Porphyrogenitus's statement indicates that the reference is in fact to him. The expression *Alii* obviously excludes the Annals of the Priest of Doclea as a source of this sentence, for this work is Tubero's main authority and all the other sources are classed as *Alii*.

Finally, Tubero also mentions some events from the reign of Basil I, when the Slavonic tribes from the eastern shores of the Adriatic took part in an expedition against the Arabs in southern Italy. These events are

²⁷ *DAI I*, 29. 235 – 236.

²⁸ *Tubero*, 89 – 90.

²⁹ *Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina*, prir. V. Mošin, Zagreb 1950, 70.

³⁰ *Tubero*, 90.

³¹ *DAI I*, 29.220 – 222.

known from Porphyrogenitus's report recorded in as many as three works written (or supervised) by him: *DAI*, *De thematibus* and *Vita Basili*.³² In Chapter 29 of *DAI* Constantine Porphyrogenitus relates that the Saracens (Arabs), raised their siege of Ragusa on hearing the news of the arrival of an imperial fleet, crossed to Longobardia and captured the town of Bari. At the Emperor's command, the Croats, Serbs, Zachlumians, Travunians, Konavlians, Ragusans, *with all the men from the towns of Dalmatia*, crossed to Langobardia and took Bari. Porphyrogenitus also notes that the Croatian and other Slavonic archontes were transported to Longobardia by the citizens of Ragusa in their vessels.³³

Orbini is also familiar with these occurrences; however, his knowledge is not based on *DAI*, but on Cedrenus and Zonaras, whose works had already been published in his time. Cedrenus's work was printed in Basle in 1566, and Zonaras was published in Venice in 1557.³⁴ Orbini took the details of these events – the Arabian siege of Ragusa, the intervention of the Byzantine fleet under Niceta Oribos, the campaign in southern Italy, the siege of Bari, etc. – from Cedrenus, who uses the data from the *Vita Basili*,³⁵ although they are also found in Chapter 29 of *DAI*. Even a cursory glance at Orbini's narration shows without doubt that his account of these events was taken over from Cedrenus, and not from Chapter 29 of *DAI*. For example, *DAI* says that the Ragusans sent an embassy to Emperor Basileus, while Cedrenus states correctly that the emperor in question was Michael, and Orbini follows him.³⁶

³² *De thematibus* was first published only in 1588. године, and *Vita Basili* in 1653; cf. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reichs*, München 1897, 255 – 256 (= Krumbacher, *Geschichte*).

³³ *DAI I*, 29.98 – 115. In *De thematibus* (Bekkerus, 61.11 – 62.20) the events are narrated without reference to the Slavonic tribes, while *Vita Basili* (cf. *Theophanes Continuatus*, *Ioannes Cameniata*, *Symeon Magister*, *Georgius Monachus*, rec. I. Bekkerus, Bonnae 1838, 292.14 – 293.19), merely states that the Slavs, too, took part in the expedition to Bari, but it does not mention individual Slavonic tribes. It is only in Chapter 26 of *DAI* that one can find details on the basis of which it is possible to reconstruct the political position of the Slavs on the eastern Adriatic shores and the Dalmatian towns in relation to the Empire.

³⁴ Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 369, 374.

³⁵ *Georgius Cedrenus Historiarum Compendium*, ed. I. Bekkerus, Bonnae 1839, 218.16 – 225.8.

³⁶ *Orbini*, 183.

Having related how Ragusa was built up, Tubero narrates that the town gradually grew populous and rich because the bareness of the soil taught its people to be industrious³⁷. After that he resumes the story of the Saracens, who defeated the Calabrians and the Apulians and captured the promontory Gargano. The Ragusans thereupon consulted with the people of Zadar³⁸ and secured the alliance of the other maritime towns of Dalmatia as well. After that they sent emissaries to the Slavs to urge them to attack the Saracens. The Slavonic people, who had recently (in the time of Pope Hadrian III) adopted Christianity and whose king ruled Dalmatia with the permission of the Emperor of Byzantium, gathered ships, sailed to Apulia and drove the Saracens from Gargano.³⁹

Tubero's account shows great similarity with that of Porphyrogenitus, but it also contains details which could have been known only to someone familiar with the entire Chapter 29 of *DAI*. Namely, references to the conversion of the Slavs and to the sovereign authority of the Emperor of Byzantium do appear in Chapter 29 of *DAI*, but they are set apart, not given in sequence, as in Tubero.⁴⁰ This shows that Tubero

³⁷ Here Tubero merely repeats what he has already said about the sterile soil and the diligence of the Ragusans; cf. *Tubero*, 90 – 91, *Iam noua urbs opibus ac ciuium multitudine, soli inopia industriam acuente, aliquantis per coaluerat, quum iterum Rhacusanorum animis Epidaurii excidii metus obuersari coepit*. It should be noted that two statements of Constantine Porphyrogenitus are merged in this passage: 1. The increase of the number of inhabitants; 2. The sterility of the soil and the industry of the Ragusans. The first statement is based on *DAI*, and the other is known only from Orbini's Italian translation of the information contained in Chapter 29 of *DAI*, i.e. from Arpontaco Burdugalense.

³⁸ No Byzantine source which could have been known to Tubero mentions Zadar as the chief town of the Byzantine theme of Dalmatia. The statement is, however, quite correct since Zadar was the seat of the strategos of Dalmatia.

³⁹ *Tubero*, 90 – 91. *Blondi Flavii Forliviensis historiarvm ab inclinatione Romanorum libri XXXI*, Basel 1531, 179 – 181 (= *Blondi*), records the military activity of the Saracens from Gargano in Italy, but he depends on Johannes the Deacon or on the later Andrea Dandolo. Tubero must have combined at least two sources in this passage – Chapter 29 of *DAI* and *Blondi*.

⁴⁰ The reference to the conversion of the Slavs of Dalmatia is in Chapter 29 of *DAI*, cf. *DAI I*, 29.68 – 75. The mention of the subjection of the Slavs to Emperor Heraclius of Byzantium, however, is at the very beginning of Chapter 29 of *DAI*, and this place is damaged in all the manuscripts of *DAI*, so that the enumeration of the Slavonic tribes is not followed by any information on their position with regard to the Empire. The next

must have been familiar with the content of the entire Chapter 29 of *DAI*, for else he could not have retold the Slavonic expedition in Longobardia so concisely or explained the political position of the Slavs and the Dalmatian towns in relation to the Empire with such unusual accuracy. It is interesting that Tubero consistently calls the Arabs *Saracens*, just as Porphyrogenitus does in Chapter 29 of *DAI*.⁴¹ Even more interesting is the mention of Pope Hadrian III, whom no known source associates with the conversion of the Slavs.⁴² Yet, Hadrian III (17. May 884 – September 885) was a contemporary of Emperor Basil I (867 – 886), who is explicitly referred to in *DAI* as the emperor who conducted the second conversion to Christianity of the Serbs, the Croats and the other Slavs of Dalmatia. Tubero's perception of the time of the conversion of the Slavs and of their subordinated position in relation to the Empire was undoubtedly chronologically associated with Basil I, who is explicitly mentioned in *DAI* in the context mentioned above. If Tubero was familiar with the entire Chapter 29 of *DAI*, he must have noticed the name of Emperor Basil, but he decided to omit it from his account. It may be presumed, however, that he introduced Basil I's contemporary Pope Hadrian III instead because he wished to preserve the correct chronological bearings.

sentence, which begins with a reference to the breakaway of these Slavs in the time of Emperor Michael Amorian (820-829) gives some ground for the inference that the conclusion of the preceding sentence was that the Slavs of Dalmatia were subjected to the Empire of the Romans; cf. *DAI I*, 29.58 – 66; *Vizantiski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, prir. B. Ferjančić, Beograd 1959, 14, n. 20.

⁴¹ *DAI I*, 29.89, 29.29.99, 29.117. Porphyrogenitus calls the Arabs *Saracens* in many other chapters of *DAI* as well; cf. *DAI I*, 14.3; 16.2, 6, 8; 17.2, 12; 21.36, 85, 88, etc. However, he also calls them *Arabs* (‘Αραβες) in many places; cf. *DAI I*, 16.10 – 11; 18.1, 5; 19.1; 20.1, 12; 21.3, 17, 37, 38, 49, 50, 52, 66, 110, 115, 120; 22.19, 22, 27, 33, 53, 57 – 59, 63, 77; 25.57.

⁴² The Priest of Doclea, for example, mentions Pope Stephen in connection with the conversion of the Slavs of Dalmatia; *Ljetopis*, 48 – 50. *Blondi*, 177, mentions Pope Hadrian II. This is not based on Dandolo, for he gives only the name of Cardinal Honorius and makes no mention of the name of the pope; besides, he only paraphrases, although rather briefly, the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea. It would seem that Blondi had the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea at his disposal. Cf. F. Šišić, *Letopis Popa Dukljanića*, Beograd 1928, 57, who believed that Blondi used Dandolo in his account of the Council at Duvanjsko Polje.

Since Tubero spent about twenty years of his life (1484 – 1502) as a monk in a monastery on the islet of St. Andrew off Ragusa, it may be supposed that his sources and the notes he made were kept in that monastery. Later, in 1502, the Ragusan Senate appointed him abbot of the Monastery of St Jacob at Višnjica.⁴³ Tubero's will provides no clue as to the fate of his personal books and notes.⁴⁴ Since no mention is made of them in the will, it may be assumed that they remained either in the Monastery of St Andrew or in the Monastery of St Jacob. In 1592 the prior of St Andrew was Mavro Orbini. If Tubero's books and papers, primarily his notes, remained in the library of the Monastery of St Andrew, this would explain how Orbini could have quoted the still unpublished Tubero's work in his *Kingdom of the Slavs*.

A careful analysis of Tubero's account of the earliest history of Ragusa reveals that he makes use of several sources. The first and basic source is the Chronicle of the Priest of Doclea. This is also the only source he mentions, and he refers to it in a number of passages. It may be noticed, however, that in his chapter on Ragusa Tubero – who had an exceptional command of Latin⁴⁵ – compiles very skillfully his sources and makes completely new sentences which flow smoothly, as if they have been copied or paraphrased from a single source. Another important source, as the preceding analysis has shown, was Constantine Porphyrogenitus, i.e. the material from Chapter 29 of *DAI*.⁴⁶ Tubero knew the whole of that chapter, not only the short report on Ragusa. A third source was undoubtedly the earliest known Ragusan poet Miletius, whose account of the origin of Ragusa is cleverly combined with Porphyrogenitus's report, as is clearly seen in the passage where Tubero

⁴³ The Monastery of St Jacob had a renowned library, to which large donations of books were made on several occasions. Thus Sigismund Philochristos bequeathed 200 books to it in 1628, and the Bishop of Ston Jovan Đurđević, a Benedictine, left to it a number of Greek codices (1605-1608). The library was damaged in the 1667 earthquake, and it sustained further and particularly severe damage from the Russian-Montenegrin army in 1806, and during the French occupation in 1808. What was left of it has been preserved mainly in the Franciscan Library in Ragusa; cf. I. Ostojić, *Benediktinci II*, Split 1964, 463.

⁴⁴ *Testamenta notariae 1525 – 1527*, f. 89v, quoted in *Tubero* (V. Rezar), XV, N. 47.

⁴⁵ Tubero's mastery of Latin is discussed in *Tubero* (V. Rezar), LIX – LXII.

⁴⁶ Vlado Rezar (*Tubero II*, XXXVIII) was the first to draw attention to *DAI* as a possible source of Tubero.

mentions the saints' relics and interpolates the name of Pancratius, as well as in the reference to the location of the Church of St Stephen Protomartyr in the centre of the town – both details known from Constantine Porphyrogenitus only. A fourth source or group of sources might be the writings of the Italian historian Flavio Biondi (1392-1463) and Marco Antonio Sabellico (1436 – 1508), both published at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century and were certainly accessible to Tubero.⁴⁷

Arpontaco Burdugalense and his work *Trattato delle mutationi degli Stati* is unknown to modern historiography.⁴⁸ Mavro Orbini refers twice to this author and his book, once in connection with the already mentioned detail concerning Ragusa, and the other time in his account of how the women of Dalmatia hurled their children at the enemy during the siege of their town.⁴⁹

The fact that no humanist from the fifteenth or sixteenth century mentions Arpontaco Burdugalense deserves some consideration. Even if such an author, or his work, now lost, did exist, how are we to explain that he is known only to Orbini? This important detail shows that the *Trattato delle mutationi degli Stati* may have been a manuscript kept in the library in which Orbini worked, i.e. at Urbino. Another possibility is that this manuscript was a part of Tubero's legacy and that he had acquired it during his stay in France. It is remarkable that neither reference to Arpontaco Burdugalense specifies the chapter or title of his

⁴⁷ The best known works of Sabellico are *Historia rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita ad obitum ducis Marci Barbadici*, Venetia 1487; *Rhapsodiae historicarum, enneades*, Venetia 1498. and 1504. Judging by what Rastić says (I have not been able to consult Sabellico's work), he makes no mention of the conflict between the Saracens, the Byzantines and the Slavs in southern Italy; cf. *Croniche di Ragusa opera di Giugno Resti senatore di Ragusa*, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium*, ed. S. Nodilo, Zagrabiae 1893, 23. More interesting is the fact that Resti refers here to Giovanni Battista Egnatius (sebben Gio. Bat. Ignazio, nella vita di Basilio, dica, che Ragusa fosse stata espugnata da 'Saraceni'), who is the selfsame Giovanni Ignatius for whom Eparch Antonius copied the earliest manuscript of *DAI* in 1509, and who published a book on the Roman emperors from Caesar to Constantine *Palaeologus* in 1516; cf. n. 8.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mavro Orbini *Kraljevstvo Slovena*, prir. S. Ćirković, Beograd 1968, 390; *Mavro Orbini Kraljevstvo Slavena*, prev. S. Husić, Zagreb 1999, 538.

⁴⁹ *Orbini*, 145.

work, although Orbini often supplies this information when he quotes from printed works. Finally, it is possible that Tubero had only excerpts from Arpontaco's work, which had been used by Orbini. In any case, Arpontaco Burdugalense remains a mystery which deserves a separate inquiry.

Tubero studied in Paris, where he was awarded the doctor's degree in - among other disciplines - mathematics. We know nothing of his life in that period. Who were his friends, were there any learned humanists among them – all this remains obscure. Arpontaco was most probably also in France. There need not have necessarily been a direct connection between Tubero and Arpontaco Burdugalense, but both of them might have had access to the same manuscript of *DAI*.

If the manuscript of *DAI* used by Arpontaco Burdugalense and Tubero dates indeed from 959, than it represents the final redaction of *DAI*. This might clarify a very important question: why there is no mention of the theme of Dalmatia in *De thematibus*. If *De thematibus* was completed in 945/955,⁵⁰ and the final version of *DAI* was completed in 959, the answer is quite clear, for Porphyrogenitus still had two versions of the text relating to the theme of Dalmatia in the manuscript of 949 and had not yet decided which one to use in the final version. The other detail from Arpontaco Burdugalense, the story of the Dalmatian women, may also have been taken from the final redaction of *DAI* and probably concerned a more circumstantial story of the fall of Salona. There is another important indication that Porphyrogenitus had not completed *DAI* by 949-952. There are a numerous passages which open with the characteristic conjunctions *Ιστέον, ὅτι, ὅτι*, indicating that the passage is merely an extract, an issue yet to be elaborated. Some chapters are obviously finished, but a number of chapters contain points which are not developed. No such conjunctions appear in *De thematibus* or in *Vita Basilii*, which is a clear indication that these works are finished. Even the passage concerning Ragusa also begins *ὅτι τὸ κάστρον τοῦ Παουσίου*. The section on Ragusa in the final redaction of *DAI* was to include the

⁵⁰ T. C. Louorghis, *Sur la date du De thematibus*, REB 31 (1973) 299 – 305; H. Ahrweiler, *Sur la date De thematibus de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète*, TM 8 (1981) 1 – 5.

remark that the overall length of the city walls was four stadia, a sentence on the economic activity of the Ragusans, as well as a new etymology for LAU, i.e. LAS. As regards the other parts of the chapter, an addition seems to have been included concerning Zadar as the chief town of the Byzantine province, as well as the inclusion of a more detailed story of the fall of Salona – this is what can be concluded from the texts of Orbini, Tubero and Arpontaco Burdugalense.

Тибор ЖИВКОВИЋ

КОНСТАНТИН ПОРФИРОГЕНИТ И ДУБРОВАЧКИ ПИСЦИ
ПРЕ 1611. ГОДИНЕ

Р е з и м е

У делу Мавра Орбина *Il Regno de gli Slavi* објављеном у Пезару 1601. године поменуто је дело Константина Порфириогенита *De Foedera, iura ac societates imperii Romani*. На основу цитата из овог дела, који Орбина наводи према Арпонтаху из Бордоа и његовом делу *Trattato delle mutatione de gli Stati*, јасно је да је у питању *De Administrando Imperio* (DAI) византијског цара Константина VII Порфириогенита, односно подаци из 29. главе у којој се говори о најстаријој прошлости Дубровника. Будући да је DAI први пут објављен 1611. године поставља се питање како је Мавро Орбини могао користити ове податке десет година раније. Разлика у 29. глави DAI и Орбиновог цитата показује да није реч о оном предлошку DAI који је 1611. године послужио првом издавачу *Meursiusu*. Основна разлика јесте прецизно навођење обима градских бедема, пола миље, који у сачуваном рукопису DAI не постоји. Друга разлика - у Орбиновој верзији на самом крају извештаја о Дубровнику дописана је и реченица о трговачким активностима Дубровчана која такође не постоји у познатој верзији DAI. На основу увида у текстове дубровачке Николе Рањине који такође у два наврата цитира податке из 29. главе

DAI средином 16. века као и на основу чињенице да Туберон почетком 16. века располаже податцима о Дубровнику које преноси и Орбин, издваја се закључак да је дубровачким писцима у 16. веку била позната верзија DAI која је данашњој науци недоступна. Разлике које су уочене као и Орбинове тврђње да је дело *De Foedera, iura ac societates imperii Romani* цар написао 959. године, отвара могућност за веома известан закључак да је Константин Порфирогенит пред сам крај живота сачинио можда и коначну верзију списа *De Administrando Imperio*.